

EXHIBIT NO. 2—CERTIFICATION AND REGULATION FEES INTERNATIONAL COMPARISONS

User Fee	Australia	United Kingdom ¹	Canada ²	Japan	United States
Air Operators Certificate	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.
Pilot License	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1997.
Licensing for Airmen Other Than Pilots	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1997.
Airmen Medical Certification	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.
Other Designees (airworthiness representatives, manufacturing inspection representatives)	Yes	No	No.
Certificate of Airworthiness	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.
Certificate of Airworthiness Renewal	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No.
Noise Type	Yes	No	Yes	No.
Noise Type Renewal	No	Yes	No.
Type Certificate	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.
Aircraft Registration	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Simulator Certificate (Annual and Renewal)	Yes	No	No.

¹ Other fees charged include: aircraft engine emissions; air traffic controllers' license (Canada also charges this fee); flying exhibit fees where more than 500 people are likely to attend.

² Generally these charges do not reflect costs of providing service. About 70–80% of Canada's regulatory function is subsidized by general taxpayers, and 20–30% is funded by user fees.

Note: Australian fees in effect on 7/90. Civil Aviation Authority (United Kingdom) fees in effect on 4/95 (rates are updated annually). Canadian fees effective as of 8/95. Japan's user fees in effect on 10/95.

As shown in the very first chart, the total projected revenue from certification, regulation, and licensing user fees is \$345.1 million. This compares with the allocated cost¹ for Aviation Regulation & Certification of \$658.6 million, resulting in a shortfall of \$313.5 million. (See Appendix No. 2, "Comparison of Costs and Revenues by Activity.") While the precise amount of the deficit can be adjusted, e.g., adjust aircraft registration fee, reexamine aircraft certification revenue projection, or institute additional fees, the bottom line is that there is a sizable deficit between revenue from user fees and the costs of providing certification and regulation services.

CONGRESS MUST ACT CAREFULLY WHEN REGULATING SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1996

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the debate about guns is as old as these United States of America. The American Revolution was about tyranny of the few over the many; and the power to control the masses included the ability to control firearms. As a result, our Founding Fathers believed it essential to guarantee the right to bear arms as a way to prevent history from repeating itself.

Throughout the ensuing 220 years, the second amendment has served us well—for food, for defense, and for sport. Guns were necessary to secure food and for protection as families settled our country during the early years of the country. Gun skills were vital to life then, remained important through two World Wars, and are still important today, especially to those outdoors enthusiasts in Wisconsin. There are many gun clubs in western Wisconsin, where young and old alike practice against targets and clay pigeons. Our hunters enjoy the sport and challenge of trying to bag a buck or a bird. We must ensure that their enjoyment can continue.

Yet everyone should recognize that the second amendment right to bear arms is not absolute. Congress has the ability to regulate the use of firearms where necessary. For example, over 60 years ago, Congress prohibited automatic weapons—machine guns—because allowing the sale of these weapons was contrary to the public interest. Today, we need to confront another growing problem—incidences of random gun violence by individuals and excessive drug-induced violence. This violence often pits our law enforcement personnel against criminals with greater firepower.

I believe that some firearms can be regulated by Congress without violating our second amendment rights. Just as a person cannot abuse his free speech rights by yelling fire in a crowded theater, there are reasonable limits that Congress may need to place on certain firearms. The issues are what firearms Congress regulates and how the regulation is conducted.

Today, we confront that issue as the House of Representatives again considers the assault weapons ban. Once again, both supporters and opponents have made their views known with emotional fervor. Both sides approach this debate with important and valid concerns. To many, the issue is the basic guaranty to bear arms provided in the second amendment to the Constitution. To others, the issue is a question of how to protect against mass killings all over the country, in both urban and rural areas.

When the House considered the assault ban in 1994, I noted that the real issue was not whether Congress could ban a short, designated list of firearms. Rather, the issue was whether, in addition to a short list, the people wanted to entrust the Federal bureaucracy with the power to decide which firearms were copies or duplicates of the firearms banned in the law or that met the additional banned firearm criteria. Supporters claimed that language prohibiting copies or duplicates is necessary to be effective and that the additional banned modifications are narrowly tailored. Opponents disagreed, noting that the effect would likely be to ban dozens of weapons. By a narrow vote of 216 to 214, the House decided that the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms [BATF] should have that power.

In my opinion, the existing assault weapons law leaves excessive discretion to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms to determine when modified firearms should be banned. I believe then, as I believe now, that providing such wide latitude is wrong and that Congress must be more specific if it is to act at all.

As a result, I will vote to repeal the assault weapons ban. I sincerely believe that Congress must act very carefully when curtailing constitutionally protected rights, and it must fully disclose the effects of the legislation it passes to regulate those rights. The House did neither when it passed the assault weapons ban in 1994.

H.R. 2202, IMMIGRATION REFORM

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1996

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for the floor debate on immigration reform due to business in my district. However, I would like to submit my views on H.R. 2202 for the RECORD.

As a Californian, I am well aware of many of the problems and economic strains associated with illegal immigration. However, we must not deter people, many who come here seeking freedom and opportunity, and many who have become productive citizens, from legally entering the United States. Many legal immigrants come to this country with a desire to work. Our challenge is to manage that flow rationally.

H.R. 2202 is an extreme measure that not only attempts to stop illegals from crossing our borders—often in unworkable and repressive ways—but also limits many of our family members such as sisters, brothers, parents, and adult children from joining us in America. This bill actually punishes legal residents and citizens by unreasonably restricting family reunification visas. It denies adult children and siblings of citizens and legal residents—many who have waited years to enter the United States—the chance to reunite with their families in America. This change in law would unfairly punish families that depend on their loved ones, not the Government, for support.

This bill also imposes annual refugee caps, limiting the number of eligible refugee applications to 50,000 per year—that's almost half of the current number. These people may be terrorized by their government, and have no other recourse than to flee their nation. Under this legislation, refugees could be turned away if the immigration quota of 50,000 for that year has been filled. This is a disgrace for a nation with a solid tradition of immigration, and a history of being a refuge for those who flee terror and deprivation.

I am disillusioned that some of my colleagues seek to make this bad bill worse by amending it to deny children an education, simply because they happen to be born to undocumented parents. Such a move would only further hurt an already disadvantaged child. It is absolutely cruel to punish innocent children for their parents' decisions.

This provision would also take a financial toll. In Los Angeles County alone—my home, and the home to nearly 30 percent of California's public school population of almost 1.5 million—the administrative costs for verification